DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 217 097 UD 022 195

TITLE	Proposed Title I Cuts: A Problem for the South.
INSTITUTION	Southern Governors' Association, Atlanta, GA.
PUB DATE	19 Mar 82
NOTE	37p.; Some tables marginally legible due to small print.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Achievement; Compensatory Education; Educationally Disadvantaged; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Aid; Federal Programs; *Financial Problems; *Program Effectiveness; Public Opinion; Public Policy
IDENTIFIERS	*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; Puerto Rico; *United States (South)

ABSTRACT

This report examines the effectiveness of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in meeting the special needs of underachieving students and describes the probable consequences of proposed cuts in Title I aid in seventeen southern States and Puerto Rico. A general description of Title I and the Federal role in educating the disadvantaged is followed by a discussion of Title I program effectiveness in the South. Title I is said to have been extremely successful in raising achievement levels of disadvantaged children. In addition, it is emphasized that public officials have favorable impressions of the program and that proposed budget cuts will result in fewer children being served, decreased staffing and quality of services, and increased social problems due to educational failure. Appendices include a resolution adopted by the Southern Governors' Association to oppose further cuts in Title I programs, and statistical data on Title I appropriations, expenditures, and financial consequences of budget cuts. (Author/MJL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED217097

PROPOSED TITLE I CUTS A PROBLEM FOR THE SOUTH

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

William D. Osborne

Southern Governors' Association

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

CG 022 199

SOUTHERN GOVERNORS' ASSOCIATION

PROPOSED TITLE I CUTS

A PROBLEM FOR

THE SOUTH

Southern Governors' Association
Suite 610
3384 Peachtree Road, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30326

404/266-1271

SO-82-MC5

March 19, 1982

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword	
A Regional Point of View	1
State-by-State Analysis	
Alabama	8
Arkansas	8
Delaware	9
Florida	10
Georgia	11
Kentucky	11
Louisiana	12
Maryland	13
Mississippi	14
Missouri	15
North Carolina	15
Oklahoma	16
Puerto Rico	17
South Carolina	18
Tennessee	19
Texas	19
Virginia	20
West Virginia	21
Appendices	
A. Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Resolution adopted by SGA on February 23, 1982)	
B. States Ranked by Relative Incidence of Poverty, 1975-76	
C. Percent of Title I Staff Used for Instruction/Support Services and Administration/Clerical in 1979-80	
D. Comparison of Title I Appropriations for 1981-82 with Recommended Cutbacks in 1982-83 and 1983-84	
E. Estimated Number of Children Eliminated From Title I Because of Proposed Budget Cuts	
F. Estimated Staff Laid Off By Title I Program Because of Proposed Budget Cuts	
G. Comparison of Title I Expenditures in the 17 States in the Southern Governors' Association With the Rest of the Nation	

FOREWORD

The Southern Region has obtained many benefits from Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The region's children – who are the future of the South – have a firmer footing on tomorrow as a result of the basic achievement skills acquired through the federal Title I program.

Title I has proven to be an effective program in Southern States. Statistics show this. More importantly, the children and young people represented by those statistics reflect the educational improvements visible in reading and mathematics achievement gains.

Southern Governors support Title I. Our support was underscored on February 23, 1982, when the Southern Governors' Association adopted a resolution to "oppose further cuts in the Title I program and urge members of Congress to oppose further cuts in Title I, Chapter I funding for FY 82, for FY 83, and beyond."

To assist members of Congress, key Administration officials, and the leadership within the Southern Region (government, business, and education) in becoming more aware of the regional value of Title I's past performance and of the possible consequences of reduced funding levels, this report was prepared.

"Proposed Title I Cuts – A Problem for the South" is published by the Southern Governors' Association to provide a regional perspective and a state-by-state analysis of the effectiveness of Title I and the possible impacts of cuts in the program.

For the Southern Governors' Association and for me as its 1981-82 Chairman, Title I is a top priority issue. That view is shared with SGA's Lead Governor for Education, Governor Harry Hughes of Maryland, and SGA's Designated Lead Governor for Elementary and Secondary Education, Governor Charles S. Robb of Virginia. On behalf of ourselves and our fellow Southern Governors, we want to be sure Congress, the Administration, and our region's leadership recognizes and understands the value and impact of Title I.

Let me express appreciation to the Federal Education Project and the Southeastern Public Education Program for their assistance in preparing this report. Also, let me thank the members of my staff and the Southern Governors' Association's staff for their assistance in reviewing and producing this report. We hope you will join with us in opposing any further cuts in Title I funding.

Governor Richard W. Riley
South Carolina

Chairman, Southern Governors' Association
March 19, 1982

PROPOSED TITLE I CUTS – A PROBLEM FOR THE SOUTH

On February 8, 1982, the Administration sent to Congress its proposed budget for fiscal year 1983 and requested that certain recisions be made to the FY 1982 budget.[1] These proposals call for substantial cuts in aid to local school districts under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Title I) (20% for the 1982-83 school year and 34% for the 1983-84 school year).[2] These cuts follow a cut of 5% for the current school year. Title I provides funds to enable school districts to offer supplementary programs in the basic skills for low-achieving students.

These proposed cuts will dramatically affect the ability of the government and educational leaders in the Southern States* to meet the special needs of their under-achieving students. These cuts will hit the Southern States especially hard because of the region's extensive poverty and below average education budgets. Equally disturbing is that these cuts come at a time when studies show that Title I funds are being used judiciously to support programs which are successful in improving educational achievement, particularly in the South.

Upon learning of the proposed cuts, the Southern Governors' Association quickly concluded that its organization should work toward maintaining a higher level of funding than proposed, due to the unique role that Title I has played in the Southern school systems. At their February 23, 1982 meeting in Washington, the Governors passed a resolution opposing further cuts in the Title I program and urging members of Congress to oppose further cuts in Title I (See Appendix A for a copy of the resolution).

This paper: (1) describes the purposes of Title I and the federal role in educating the disadvantaged, (2) documents the effectivenss of the Title I program, and (3) describes the major consequences of the cuts. These topics are addressed from two perspectives: first from a regional point of view and second on a state-by-state basis.

WHAT IS TITLE I? WHY IS IT IMPORTANT?

Title I enables local school districts to provide supplementary instruction in the basic skills to under-achieving students. Title I funds are distributed to states, school districts, and schools on the basis of the incidence of children from low-income families. Children are selected for participation solely on the basis of educational need, i.e., low-income is not a factor in determining student participation. A Title I program must be of sufficient size, scope, and quality to promise success in improving basic skills. Under no circumstances may programs be excessive, extravagant, or imprudent.

Charles Radcliffe, Chief Aide to Congressman Ashbrook (R-Ohio), the ranking Republican member of the House Education and Labor Committee, has succinctly expressed the importance of Title I to our nation: "It goes right to a whole host of social

---

*The Southern States include the states in the Southern Governor's Association: Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia and West Virginia. The Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico are also members of SGA.

problems. If you can't prevent dependency at the elementary school level, you won't be able to break that cycle and save the country billions and billions of dollars in welfare and unemployment aid."[3]

DOES TITLE I HAVE SPECIAL SIGNIFICANCE FOR THE SOUTHERN STATES?

Yes. All school districts in the South are eligible for Title I funding. Presently, of the 4,000 school districts in the South, all but 250 actually apply for and receive extra funds from Title I. Maintaining and increasing the level of Title I appropriations is crucial to the South because of the extensive poverty (and associated under-achievement) and below average education budgets. Of the fifteen (15) states with the largest percentage of poor families, thirteen (13) are in the southern region. (See Appendix B) Because Title I funds are distributed to states based on poverty factors, the South has received and will now lose substantial amounts of assistance.

The Title I program is also important to the South because its continued economic growth demands a minimally competent workforce. Governor Riley of South Carolina, Chairman of the Southern Governors' Association, in a recent speech called Title I cutbacks "short sighted""

> "The 1990s hold in store a decade of high technology. It will be essential for future employees to have at a minimum a sound foundation in the basic skills as well as technical and professional skills."

ARE THERE ENOUGH TITLE I FUNDS TO SERVE ALL LOW-ACHIEVING STUDENTS?

Presently Title I is significantly under-funded. As the U.S. Department of Education's Annual Report to Congress makes clear, the annual appropriations for Title I have consistently fallen far below the authorized level. And, although appropriations have increased (with the exception of the 1981-82 school year), they have not kept pace with inflation. Thus, the appropriation for the 1980-81 school year actually had a lower purchasing power than the 1970 appropriation.[4]

The fact that Title I is underfunded means that large numbers of low-achieving students eligible for Title I are not actually receiving extra help in the basic skills. The National Institute of Education reported in 1977 that only two-thirds of elementary school children eligible for assistance actually received extra help.[5] Currently, estimates of unmet needs in the Southern States are that school districts are serving half of the eligible elementary school children and about 10% of the eligible high school students. Thus, the data indicate that the current appropriations are not extravagant. To the contrary, more, not less, funds are needed to bring the Title I program to all eligible children.

SHOULD THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT CONTINUE TO PLAY A ROLE IN ASSISTING SCHOOL DISTRICTS TO MEET THE EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF THE DISADVANTAGED?

The National Governors' Association, in its February, 1982 meeting passed a resolution supporting the continued role of the federal government in aiding the disadvantaged:

"The National Governors' Association recognizes that in matters of overriding national concern, those not limited to any one state or group of states, the federal government does have an interest and responsibility...We believe that the shared state/federal role should be limited to the following areas...special populations...(including) educationally disadvantaged...."

The resolution passed by the Southern Governors' Association on February 23, 1982 (See Appendix A) also supports the continued role of the federal government in aiding the educationally disadvantaged.

IS THE TITLE I PROGRAM EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT?

When Secretary Bell testified before the House Education and Labor Committee last May he said: "I know, and I can testify to this Committee that our Title I programs are successful." The 1981 Annual Report to Congress submitted by the U.S. Department of Education recently concluded that "in general, Title I services are well-targeted..., supplemental..., and are effective in helping participating students to progress beyond what would be expected from the program."[6] The report also concluded that the results of Title I evaluations "suggest that a fifteen year decline in educational achievement in beginning to reverse, particularly among low-achieving groups."[7]

In 1981 the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP) found, in its assessment of educational achievement of America's 9, 13, and 17 year olds, that groups traditionally viewed as disadvantaged have made substantial gains at the elementary level.[8] These gains were most significant in Title I schools: "these significant changes and the overall pattern of a narrowing gap...strongly suggest that students in Title I schools are improving at a faster rate than students in non-Title I schools."[9]

The national Title I Evaluation and Reporting System (TIERS) recently found that children in Title I programs made substantial achievement gains: "In the 1979-80 school year, children experienced an average percentile growth rate in reading of 4 to 37% and 5 to 44% in math in grades 2 through 8."[10]

In addition to being an effective program, Title I is also efficient, i.e., Title I funds are used judiciously to avoid excessive, extravagent, and imprudent expenditures. Efficiency is necessitated by the fact that so many children requiring Title I assistance remain unserved due to insufficient appropriations. For example, NIE found that because of Title I's emphasis on the basic skills and financial pressures, nationally only 4% of the Title I budget was spent on auxiliary services.[11] Statistics in the southern States indicate that Title I funds are used primarily to pay for additional staff; 95% of whom provide instructional and support services and only 5% perform administrative and clerical functions. (See Appendix C)

In sum, every evaluation of Title I leads to one simple conclusion — Title I is an effective and efficient program.

HAS TITLE I INCREASED STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT IN THE SOUTH?

The infusion of Title I funds into the Southern States has had a tremendous effect on the performance of the children receiving these services. The achievement test performance of Title I children who, without these programs would be expected to fall years below grade level, are considered by many to be "phenomenal."

The U.S. Department of Education has designed a system to uniformly record achievement gains referred to as Normal Curve Equivalents or NCEs. If a Title I program has had no special effect over and above the effect of a regular program, the expected NCE gain would be zero. Positive NCE gains indicate the effects of the special resources provided by Title I. Virtually every state in the South reports significant NCE gains. Even more importantly, these gains have increased each of the four years the system has been in place.

The successes reported in the state evaluations are confirmed by the recent NAEP report which studied the change in reading performance at three intervals over the past 10 years. It found that at each age level tested (9, 13 and 17) and especially for 9 year olds, the gains made by disadvantaged children were "most impressive."[12] The most "dramatic" achievement gains were for 9 year olds in the southeastern region.

As David Hornback, Superintendent of Public Schools in Maryland, has stated:

> "Today we are on the edge of not only keeping thousands of young people in school (no small accomplishment itself) but in raising and maintaining achievement levels on a par with non-Title I eligible children. In fact, in Baltimore City this past year, we actually saw for the first time at several grade levels and on several reading and arithmetic nationally normed sub-tests that the students met or exceeded the national norms."

State officials across the South describe the dramatic changes in the attitudes of children in Title I programs. As failure patterns are reversed, these children for the first time in their lives, begin to view themselves as capable of learning. This growth in self-confidence accelerates learning, encourages learning additional skills, and reduces drop-out rates.

This success is infectious and has increased the confidence of the parents of Title I children in the schools they attend. Joe Kelly, the Arkansas Title I Director, reports that parents who had been turned off from the schooling process are re-entering the system with hope, "ending the cycle of extreme isolation and alienation which has existed between parents and schools."

Governor Richard Riley of South Carolina, has noted the obvious connection between academic failure and in-school problems (truancy, drop-outs, high absenteeism) and out-of-school life-time problems (delinquency, incarceration, unemployment): "There is a danger that if these children do not receive special help today, they could become the burdens of our society tomorrow."

WHAT DO THE FEDERAL AND STATE ELECTED OFFICIALS SAY ABOUT TITLE I's SUCCESS?

In reaction to the results of the National Assessment, Congressman Perkins (D-Ky), Chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, stated:

> "I am extremely encouraged by the results of this third reading assessment, in particular the significant gains for nine-year-olds from rural and disadvantaged urban areas. To me, this data strongly suggests that our Federal education programs, especially Title I...are working well. I think it would be exceptionally foolish to cut back on these programs now when we are seeing some real improvements."

Senator Stafford (R-Vt), Chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, Arts, and Humanities, reacted to the National Assessment's report by stating:

> "Especially noteworthy are the results of the reading assessment which relate to the effectiveness of Title I...The assessment suggests that Title I is being correctly targeted, and is narrowing the gap between targeted and non-targeted populations...Yet these results indicate that much more remains to be done...."

Governor Winter of Mississippi, in opposing further cuts to Title I, explained:

> "Mississippi has the highest proportion of low-income students in the nation. Many of the children have difficulties in the basic skills. This deficiency is one principal reason our State lags behind the other states in several educational areas. Title I programs are having positive effects on basic skills achievement of Mississippi children."

Governor Hunt of North Carolina recently stated:

> "Title I ESEA projects have positive effects on students in North Carolina. As a result of participation in Title I projects, these students make significant achievement gains in reading and mathematics – gains that are much greater than would have been the case had they not participated in the project."

WHAT AMOUNT OF TITLE I FUNDS WOULD THE SOUTH LOSE IF THE PROPOSED CUTS ARE ADOPTED BY CONGRESS?

If the Administration's budget proposals are adopted by Congress, the school districts in the South would lose approximately $226 million Title I funds for the 1982-83 school year ($922 million down from $1.148 billion in 1981-82 school year). For the 1983-84 school year, the South would lose approximately $389 million ($759 million down from $1.148 billion in 1981-82 school year). The total loss for the two-year period would be $615 million. (See Appendix D)

HOW MANY CHILDREN WOULD BE ELIMINATED FROM THE PROGRAM?

If the proposed budget cuts are adopted, the Southern States would have to cut 522,100 children from the Title I program in the 1982-83 school year and 839,200 in the 1983-84 school year, for a total of 1,361,300 children. This estimate is low because inflation may mean that even fewer children can be served because the same services will cost more. By comparison, the program served 2,266,300 children in the 1979-80 school year. (See Appendix E)

HOW MANY TEACHERS AND OTHER STAFF WILL HAVE TO BE LAID OFF BECAUSE OF THE CUTS?

If the proposed budget cuts are adopted, Southern States would experience cumulative layoffs of approximately 20,000 staff from the Title I programs in the 1982-83 school year, 32,000 as a result of the 1983-84 cuts, for a total of 52,000 staff over the two-year period. It is impossible to assess whether a particular school district would lay off, greater proportions of paraprofessionals than its professional staff. If more

paraprofessionals than professionals are laid off, the actual number of staff laid off will be larger than this estimate since paraprofessionals earn less than professionals. This estimate is also low because inflation may mean even fewer staff can be employed. (See Appendix F)

WHAT EFFECT WILL THE BUDGET CUTS HAVE ON THE SCOPE AND QUALITY OF THE TITLE I PROGRAM AND SCHOOL DISTRICTS' REGULAR PROGRAM?

In addition to serving fewer children, there are indications that budget cuts would also reduce the quality of the Title I services for students remaining in the program. Almost without exception, states are reporting that the most experienced, qualified, and committed teachers and other staff are leaving or considering leaving the Title I program in anticipation of future cuts. Several persons characterized this phenomena as "devastating" to the program. A local administrator in West Virginia reported:

> "Title I used to be the dumping ground for poor teachers. Today, assignment to a Title I class means prestige, especially for teachers with strong reading backgrounds. The talk about large budget cuts is already resulting in our most capable teachers looking elsewhere for job security. The handwriting is already on the wall that in the future Title I will once again be a dumping ground."

The loss of Title I assistance will also place a tremendous strain on school districts' basic program of instruction since the regular teacher will have to provide greater attention to the under-achievers than in the past, leaving less time for the average and high achievers. In addition, the ability of local school districts to provide adequate remediation for children who fail to pass state minimum competency examinations will be greatly reduced.

Don Morton, from Etawah County, Alabama explained that it will be a "tremendous problem to continue Title I with local funds" and predicts "teachers will go crazy without Title I to assist with special needs."

WHAT OTHER EFFECTS CAN BE EXPECTED IF THE PROPOSED BUDGET CUTS ARE ADOPTED?

Agreeing with Governor Riley that "a solid education translates into less crime, less unemployment and better health," Maryland's Superintendent Hornbeck recently noted the ripple effects of Title I cutbacks:

> "The present waste of human resources, not to mention the loss of taxes from productive income, which is reflected in the unemployment rates of youth and young adults, will continue, particularly among poor and minority young people. The average reading level of those in prison is less than fifth grade. Does anyone doubt a cause-effect relationship? The cost of welfare for those who are unemployable because they are uneducated and unskilled results in costs far greater than reeducation. There are so many other examples of social pathology resulting from educational failure. With Title I, there can be continuing success and improvement. Without it we will face other increased problems of dramatic proportions."

IS IT REALISTIC TO EXPECT THAT ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS CAN BE CUT TO MAKE UP FOR THE LOSS OF TITLE I FUNDS?

No. Only 5 percent of staff costs are used for administrative and clerical positions. (See Appendix C) Some administrative costs are necessary for fiscal and program accountability. A cut of 20% for the 1982-83 school year and 34% for the 1983-84 school year can not be made up by eliminating unnecessary administrative costs.

IS IT REALISTIC TO EXPECT THAT STATES AND LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS WILL BE ABLE TO MAKE UP FOR THE LOSS OF FEDERAL FUNDS?

No. The increased burden being placed on state and local revenues from federal cutbacks in other educational and domestic service areas, as well as cutbacks in state and locally funded programs, makes it wholly unrealistic to think that states and local school systems are going to be able and/or willing to make up the loss. The situation is exascerbated in the South, where Title I constitutes a far greater proportion of the total education budget than in any other region in the country. (See Appendix G) As Governor Winter of Mississippi explained: "Most Mississippi school districts are already taxing to their legal limits and fighting to keep their heads above water. It will be extremely difficult to compensate locally for the losses in federal revenues."

FOOTNOTES

1. All federal education programs are forward-funded, which means that funds appropriated for FY 82 are for use in the 1982-83 school year. Throughout this paper, reference will be made to appropriations by the school year for which they are available.

2. Title I of the Elementary Act of 1965, as amended by P.L. 95-561, has been superseded by Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981. Title I provides funding in five categories: LEA Basic Grants, LEA Concentration Grants, Grants for State Title I Programs for Migratory Children, Grants for State Title I Programs for Handicapped Children and State Grants for Title I Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children. This report only addresses the two LEA funding categories, the Basic and the Concentration Grants, which are used by school districts for programs for disadvantaged children.

3. Stanfield, "If It Aint Broke, Don't Fix It, Say Defenders of Compensatory Aid," National Journal (Jan 30, 1982, p. 202).

4. "Education of Disadvantaged Children," from the FY 81 Annual Evaluation Report on Educational Programs to Congress, at p. 8.

5. NIE, Compensatory Education Services, at pp. 11-14 (1977).

6. USDE, Annual Evaluation Report FY 81, Vol. I, Secretary's Summary.

7. Id.

8. NAEP, "Has Title I Improved Education for Disadvantaged Students?" (April 23, 1981).

9. Id.

10. USDE, Annual Evaluation Report, FY 81, Vol. I, Secretary's Summary.

11. Supra, note 5 at p. 66.

12. NAEP, supra, note 8.

STATE-BY-STATE ANALYSIS

ALABAMA

Title I provides financial assistance for supplementary instruction in the basic skills in 126 out of 127 school districts in Alabama. Title I funds are used primarily to pay for additional staff; 97.4% of whom provide instructional and support services and only 2.6% perform administrative and clerical functions.

Evaluation results provide convincing evidence that Title I is significantly raising achievement levels in the basic skills. The 1979-80 state evaluation measured achievement gains in terms of NCE scores. A zero NCE score would be expected if the Title I program had no effect; 3 would indicate a good gain; and 7 would mean exemplary results are evident. Statewide reading gains range from an average of 1.34 at the second grade level to 4.82 at the fifth grade level. The range in math gains was 1.78 to 6.12 NCEs.

A major concern in the state is that the current Title I appropriations do not permit school districts to serve all the children eligible for assistance. Tens of thousands of eligible students, especially in the secondary grades, remain unserved. Proposed budget cuts will significantly increase the number of unserved children.

Under the Administration's proposal, LEA appropriations for the 1982-83 school year would be reduced by $13.5 million (from $68.8 million in 1981-82 to $55.3 million). This would cut about 31,300 children and 1,027 staff from the program. For the 1983-84 school year, the cuts would be even greater – the appropriation would be reduced by $23.2 million (from $68.8 million in 1981-82 to $45.6 million). This would mean that 48,700 children would be eliminated from the program and 1,633 staff would be laid off. In sum, during this two-year period, $36.7 million fewer Title I funds would be appropriated; 80,000 fewer children would be served; and 2,660 staff would be laid off from the program.

As Joe Kelly, Title I Director, predicts: the cuts "will eliminate even more children and teachers, because of inflation. A 20% cutback will be disastrous."

Charts comparing the impact of the budget cuts in Alabama to the cuts in the other member states in the Southern Governors' Association are set out in the appendices to this paper.

ARKANSAS

Title I provides financial assistance for supplementary instruction in the basic skills in all of the school districts in Arkansas. Title I funds are used primarily to pay for additional staff; 95.2% of whom provide instructional and support services and only 4.8% perform administrative and clerical functions.

Statewide evaluation results provide convincing evidence that Title I is significantly raising achievement levels in the basic skills. The 1979-80 state evaluation measured achievement gains in terms of NCE scores. A zero NCE score would be expected if the Title I program had no effect; 3 would indicate a good gain; and 7 would mean exemplary results are evident. The statewide reading achievement at all grade levels of 6 NCEs is considered "phenomenal" by the Title I Director, C.E. Morris, particularly in light of the steady improvement seen over the past three years. The highest average grade level NCE gain in reading was 11 in grade 2; the low was 3 at grades 10 and 11. "If these gains were only for one LEA, something would appear to be wrong; however this data is statewide and becoming stronger each year." In math, gains of as high as 10 were seen in certain grade levels.

A major concern in the state is that the current Title I appropriations do not permit school districts to serve all the children eligible for assistance. It is believed that over 70,000 children, many of whom are in the secondary grades, remain unserved. Proposed budget cuts will significantly increase the number of eligible but unserved children.

Under the Administration's proposal, LEA appropriations for the 1982-83 school year would be reduced by $7.6 million (from $39.2 million in 1981-82 to $31.6 million). This would cut about 18,200 children and 902 staff from the program. For the 1983-84 school year, the cuts would be even greater – the appropriation would be reduced by $13.2 million (from $39.2 million in 1981-82 to $26.0 million). This would mean that 30,000 children would be eliminated from the program and 1,438 staff would be laid off. In sum, during this two-year period, $20.8 million fewer Title I funds would be appropriated; 48,200 fewer children would be served; and 2,340 staff would be laid off from the program.

"The proposed cuts coupled with the clearly indicated lack of commitment of the federal government is absolutely devastating" for Title I in Arkansas, according to Title I Director, C.E. Morris. He explained that after 16 years of recruiting, training and educating teachers and aides for Title I, these people are "the best teachers in the public schools." The anticipation of funding cuts has caused teachers and aides to move on to more secure jobs, leaving less qualified and less experienced staff. He predicts that it is unlikely local school districts or the state government will be able to assume many of these costs: "Political blockage is more evident at local levels of government than the federal level. Not many are going to sacrifice to give more assistance to under-achievers than regular children."

Charts comparing the impact of the budget cuts in Arkansas to the cuts in the other member states in the Southern Governors' Association are set out in the appendices to this paper.

DELAWARE

Title I provides financial assistance for supplementary instruction in the basic skills in all 17 of the regular school districts in Delaware. Title I funds are used primarily to pay for additional staff; 94.5% of whom provide instructional and support services and only 5.5% perform administrative and clerical functions.

Evaluation results provide solid evidence that Title I is significantly raising achievement levels in the basic skills. The 1979-80 state evaluation measured achievement gains in terms of NCE scores. A zero NCE score would be expected if the Title I program had no effect; 3 would indicate a good gain; and 7 would mean exemplary results are evident. The average grade level gains in reading on a nine-month cycle range from a low at grade 8 of 4.15 NCEs to a high of 10.93 NCEs in grade 2; math gains display a range of 4.05 NCEs in grade 7 and a high of 10.96 NCEs in grade 2. The gains reported on the twelve-month tests in these subjects are lower but record gains at each grade level.

A major concern in the state is that the current Title I appropriations do not permit school districts to serve all the children eligible for assistance. Despite the clear need, lack of adequate funds has limited service in the secondary grades. Proposed budget cuts will significantly increase the number of eligible but unserved children.

Under the Administration's proposal, LEA appropriations for the 1982-83 school year would be reduced by $1.2 million (from $6.7 million in 1981-82 to $5.5 million). This would cut about 2,800 children and 118 staff from the program. For the 1983-84 school

year, the cuts would be even greater – the appropriation would be reduced by $2.2 million (from $6.7 million in 1981-82 to $4.5 million). This would mean that 4,500 children would be eliminated from the program and 135 staff would be laid off. In sum, during this two-year period, $3.4 million fewer Title I funds would be appropriated; 7,300 fewer children would be served; and 303 staff would be laid off from the program.

Charts comparing the impact of the budget cuts in Delaware to the cuts in the other member states in the Southern Governors' Association are set out in the appendices to this paper.

FLORIDA

Title I provides financial assistance for supplementary instruction in the basic skills in all 67 school districts in Florida. Title I funds are used primarily to pay for additional staff; 95% of whom provide instructional and support services and only 5% perform administrative and clerical functions.

Evaluation results provide convincing evidence that title I is significantly raising achievement levels in the basic skills. The 1979-80 state evaluation measured achievement gains in terms of NCE scores. A zero NCE score would be expected if the Title I program had no effect; 3 would indicate a good gain; and 7 would mean exemplary results are evident. Florida's Title I program reported aggregate gains in reading of 2.91 NCEs, in math 4.83 NCEs, and in language arts 5.64 NCEs. Although Florida reports indicate mixed results for the separate grades, "in the aggregate, however, post-test NCEs were systematically higher."

A major concern in the state is that the current Title I appropriations do not permit school districts to serve all the children eligible for assistance. Tens of thousands of eligible students, especially in the secondary grades, remain unserved. Proposed budget cuts will significantly increase the number of eligible but unserved children.

Under the Administration's proposal, LEA appropriations for the 1982-83 school year would be reduced by $16.1 million (from $81.3 million in 1981-82 to $65.2 million). This would cut about 40,500 children and 1,783 staff from the program. For the 1983-84 school year, the cuts would be even greater – the appropriation would be reduced by $27.6 million (from $81.3 million in 1981-82 to $53.7 million). This would mean that 61,200 children would be eliminated from the program and 2,669 staff would be laid off. In sum, during this two-year period, $43.7 million fewer Title I funds would be appropriated; 101,700 fewer children would be served; and 4,452 staff would be laid off from the program.

The proposed cuts will also have other adverse effects. Charles George, a parent of a Title I student in Dade County, Florida put it this way: "We submit that if we don't deal with them (the under-achieving/disadvantaged students) now, we're going to have to deal with them later in criminal institutions. Some commercials say 'pay now or pay later'. We'll pay later, and I think we'll pay with interest."

Charts comparing the impact of the budget cuts in Florida to the cuts in the other member states in the Southern Governors' Association are set out in the appendices to this paper.

GEORGIA

Title I provides financial assistance for supplementary instruction in the basic skills in all 167 school districts in Georgia. Title I funds are used primarily to pay for additional staff; 95% of whom provide instructional and support services and only 5% perform administrative and clerical functions.

Evaluation results provide convincing evidence that Title I is significantly raising achievement levels in the basic skills. The 1979-80 state evaluation measured achievement gains in terms of NCE scores. A zero NCE score would be expected if the Title I program had no effect; 3 would indicate a good gain; and 7 would mean exemplary results are evident. Georgia's Title I program reported NCE gains in reading in grades 2-9 respectively of 4.58, 6.56, 8.24, 6.59, 3.36, 3.34, .18, and 3.78.

A major concern in the state is that the current Title I appropriations do not permit school districts to serve all the children eligible for assistance. Tens of thousands of eligible students, especially in secondary grades, remain unserved. Proposed budget cuts will significantly increase the number of eligible but unserved children.

Under the Administration's proposal, LEA appropriations for the 1982-83 school year would be reduced by $14.3 million (from $74.5 million in 1981-82 to $60.2 million). This would cut about 39,200 children and 792 staff from the program. For the 1983-84 school year, the cuts would be even greater – the appropriation would be reduced by $25 million (from $74.5 million in 1981-82 to $49.5 million). This would mean that 60,600 children would be eliminated from the program and 1,280 staff would be laid off. In sum, during this two-year period, $39.3 million fewer Title I funds would be appropriated; 99,800 fewer children would be served; and 2,072 staff would be laid off from the program.

The proposed cuts will also have other adverse effects. Dr. Morgan of the Dougherty County School System in Albany, Georgia reacted in the following manner to the proposed cuts: "Title I gives a chance to under-achieving students who otherwise would go untaught. It is cost-effective and produces tremendous academic and social benefits. The taxpayers come out ahead by having employable graduates. Proposed budget cuts will mean that we will be able to reach significantly fewer children. This is a real tragedy."

Charts comparing the impact of the budget cuts in Georgia to the cuts in the other member states in the Southern Governors' Association are set out in the appendices to this paper.

KENTUCKY

Title I provides financial assistance for supplementary instruction in the basic skills in all 180 school districts in Kentucky. Title I funds are used primarily to pay for additional staff; 95% of whom provide instructional and support services and only 5% perform administrative and clerical functions.

Evaluation results provide convincing evidence that Title I is significantly raising achievement levels in the basic skills. The 1979-80 state evaluation measured achievement gains in terms of NCE scores. A zero NCE score would be expected if the Title I program had no effect; 3 would indicate a good gain; and 7 would mean exemplary results are evident. During the 1979-80 school year, the average grade level gains in mathematics ranged from 3.0 NCEs (grade 5) to 7.5 NCEs (grades 2 and 6) on twelve-month achievement testing cycles; and reading scores on the nine-month testing cycles

ranged from 4.9 NCEs to 7.9 NCEs. First graders gained, on the average, 16.3 NCE gains in reading readiness skills.

A major concern in the state is that the current Title I appropriations permit the school districts to serve less than half of all the children in need of this assistance. Over one hundred thousand children remain unserved, the greater proportion of which are in the secondary grades.

Under the Administration's proposal, appropriations for the 1982-83 school year would be reduced by $10 million (from $53 million in 1981-82 to $43 million). This would cut about 28,200 children and 893 staff from the program. For the 1983-84 school year, the cuts would be even greater – the appropriation would be reduced by $17.6 million (from $53 million in 1981-82 to $35.4 million). This would mean that 43,400 children would be eliminated from the program and 1,432 staff would be laid off. In sum, during this two-year period, $27.6 million fewer Title I funds would be appropriated; 71,600 fewer children would be served; and 2,325 staff would be laid off from the program.

The proposed cuts will also have other adverse effects on the scope and quality of the program. Don Hart, Title I Director, described that Title I, because of its concentration and focus on the needs of this group of under-achieving students, has extended "numerous concomitant benefits to the rest of the educational programs in the state." The evaluation process, required by Title I, has been an incentive to evaluate the effectiveness of other educational programs.

Charts comparing the impact of the budget cuts in Kentucky to the cuts in the other member states in the Southern Governors' Association are set out in the appendices to this paper.

LOUISIANA

Title I provides financial assistance for supplementary instruction in the basic skills in all 66 parishes in Louisiana. Title I funds are used primarily to pay for additional staff; 96% of whom provide instructional and support services and only 4% perform administrative and clerical functions.

Evaluation results provide convincing evidence that Title I is significantly raising achievement levels in the basic skills. The 1979-80 state evaluation measured achievement gains in terms of NCE scores. A zero NCE score would be expected if the Title I program had no effect; 3 would indicate a good gain; and 7 would mean exemplary results are evident. Average grade level gains ranging from 3.19 NCEs to 9.93 were reported from the nine-month testing cycles at grades 2 through 8; math gains ranged from 4.45 to 10.5.

Under the Administration's proposal, LEA appropriations for the 1982-83 school year would be reduced by $15.5 million (from $78.4 million in 1981-82 to $62.9 million). This would cut about 37,300 children and 1,442 staff from the program. For the 1983-84 school year, the cuts would be even greater – the appropriation would be reduced by $26.6 million (from $78.4 million in 1981-82 to $51.8 million). This would mean that 59,500 children would be eliminated from the program and 2,253 staff would be laid off. In sum, during this two-year period, $42.1 million fewer Title I funds would be appropriated; 96,800 fewer children would be served; and 3,695 staff would be laid off from the program.

The proposed cuts will also have other adverse effects on the scope and quality of the program. The Title I Director reports that current school year reductions, combined with the threat of deeper cuts, have already resulted in "economic, education, and personal loss." The loss of jobs causes a loss of income and valuable teachers to the parishes, as well as requiring that the reduced funds pay unemployment compensation rather than program salaries.

Already "the stability of established Title I programs (has been) disrupted," and will continue to be disrupted. But "the greatest impact of all is the decreases in the number of disadvantaged children that will receive needed educational services. A number of parishes have already cut services to high school students and either reduced or deleted the second and third educational priorities." (Memorandum from Ed Green, Title I Director, January 25, 1982).

Charts comparing the impact of the budget cuts in Louisiana to the cuts in the other member states in the Southern Governors' Association are set out in the appendices to this paper.

MARYLAND

Title I provides financial assistance for supplementary instruction in the basic skills in all 24 school districts in Maryland. Title I funds are used primarily to pay for over 4,000 additional staff; over 96.5% of whom provide instructional and support services and 3.5% of whom perform administrative and clerical functions.

Evaluation results provide convincing evidence that Title I is significantly raising achievement levels in the basic skills. The 1979-80 state evaluation measured achievement gains in terms of NCE scores. A zero NCE score would be expected if the Title I program had no effect; 3 would indicate a good gain; and 7 would mean exemplary results are evident. In reading tests conducted at grades 2-6 (Fall to Spring), the average grade level score ranged from 1.9 NCEs at grade 5 to 7.9 NCEs at grade 6. The average math gains for this same age range was 1.5 NCEs in grade 3 and 11.0 NCEs at grade 6.

A major concern in the state is that the current Title I appropriations have only been sufficient to serve about 60% of the Title I eligible children. The Title I four-year-old pre-school program, which provides successful early intervention for 25 schools, is desperately needed in many more schools. Instead of expanding this initiative, proposed budget cuts will add tens of thousands to the number of eligible but unserved children.

Under the Administration's proposal, LEA appropriations for the 1982-83 school year would be reduced by $8.9 million (from $45.4 million in 1981-82 to $36.5 million). This would cut about 15,800 children from the program. For the 1983-84 school year, the cuts would be even greater – the appropriation would be reduced by $15.4 million (from $45.4 million in 1981-82 to $30.0 million). This would mean that 24,300 children would be eliminated from the program. In sum, during this two-year period, $24.3 million fewer Title I funds would be appropriated; 40,100 fewer children would be served.

The proposed cuts would be costly to Maryland, not only in lost revenues but in wasted resources. David Hornbeck, Superintendent of Maryland Schools said recently: "If Maryland's share of Title I suffers a loss of thirty-five percent, there is absolutely no question but that already existing opportunities for tens of thousands of poor children will be discontinued, including some of the crucial pre-school programs. With the four percent

cut this year, it required cutbacks in every single instance I know of across the state. With more it will reach devastating proportions."

Charts comparing the impact of the budget cuts in Maryland to the cuts in the other member states in the southern Governors' Association are set out in the appendices to this paper.

MISSISSIPPI

Title I provides financial assistance for supplementary instruction in the basic skills in all 156 school districts in Mississippi. Title I funds are used primarily to pay for additional staff; 94% of whom provide instructional and support services and only 6% perform administrative and clerical functions.

Evaluation results provide convincing evidence that Title I is significantly raising achievement levels in the basic skills. The 1979-80 state evaluation measured achievement gains in terms of NCE scores. A zero NCE score would be expected if the Title I program had no effect; 3 would indicate a good gain; and 7 would mean exemplary results are evident. Mississippi's Title I program reported NCE gains in reading, grades 2-12 respectively of 7.39, 6.22, 5.98, 5.05, 4.47, 6.04, 3.30, 3.18, 4.16, 1.47, -.02. Individual schools reported gains as high as 22.3.

A major concern in the State is that the current Title I appropriations do not permit school districts to serve all the children eligible for assistance. Tens of thousands of eligible students, especially in the secondary grades, remain unserved. Proposed budget cuts will significantly increase the number of eligible but unserved children.

Under the Administration's proposal, LEA appropriations for the 1982-83 school year would be reduced by $13.2 million (from $66.2 million in 1981-82 to $53 million). This would cut about 25,800 children and 1,390 staff from the program. For the 1983-84 school year, the cuts would be even greater – the appropriation would be reduced by $22.5 million (from $66.2 million in 1981-82 to $43.7 million). This would mean that 53,100 children would be eliminated from the program and 2,204 staff would be laid off. In sum, during this two-year period, $35.7 million fewer Title I funds would be appropriated; 78,900 fewer children would be served; and 3,594 staff would be laid off from the program.

The proposed cuts will also have other adverse effects on the scope and quality of the program. As Alvin Smith of Wayne County, Mississippi, explained "the proposed cuts are already having an impact on program effectiveness. Dedicated, committed, and well-qualified teachers are leaving in search of what they feel will be a more stable position." Bill Metcalf of Clarksdale, Mississippi explained that in his Title I program, many staff members were terminated in anticipation of substantial 1981-82 cuts, which did not materialize. So he has a significant carryover. But he noted: "I'm in trouble once we exhaust the carryover." He also added that if the budget cuts are adopted, the Title I programs in the smaller districts "will go by the wayside."

Charts comparing the impact of the budget cuts in Mississippi to the cuts in the other member states in the Southern Governors' Association are set out in the appendices to this paper.

MISSOURI

Title I provides financial assistance for supplementary instruction in the basic skills in 415 out of 550 school districts in Missouri. Title I funds are used primarily to pay for additional staff; 98% of whom provide instructional and support services and only 2% perform administrative and clerical functions.

Evaluation results provide convincing evidence that Title I has been a "great success in general" in Missouri, and has significantly raised achievement levels in the basic skills. The 1979-80 state evaluation measured achievement gains in terms of NCE scores. A zero NCE score would be expected if the Title I program had no effect; 3 would indicate a good gain; and 7 would mean exemplary results are evident. The average grade level gains in reading on a twelve-month tests display a range of 5.7 NCEs as the low and 7.6 NCEs as the high. Math gains are as high as 12.4 NCEs at grade 1.

Under the Administration's proposal, LEA appropriations for the 1982-83 school year would be reduced by $9.4 million (from $48.6 million in 1981-82 to $39.2 million). This would cut about 16,800 children and 691 staff from the program. For the 1983-84 school year, the cuts would be even greater – the appropriation would be reduced by $16.3 million (from $48.6 million in 1981-82 to $32.3 million). This would mean that 29,300 children would be eliminated from the program and 1,154 staff would be laid off. In sum, during this two-year period, $25.7 million fewer Title I funds would be appropriated; 46,100 fewer children would be served; and 1,845 staff would be laid off from the program.

The proposed cuts will also have other adverse effects on the scope and quality of the program. B.L. Laney, Title I Director, said school districts might sustain a 10% decrease in Title I funds, but noted that a 25% cut "is past the point of a few problems."

Although many of the districts in Missouri have said that they can't afford to do away with Title I's successful reading program, raising additional funds will be extremely difficult in this state. Recently the state announced that it will be forced to delay income tax refunds in order to make school aid foundation payments. Most districts are already levying a maximum property tax rate and must get a two-thirds popular vote to increase taxes, a feat which is becoming more difficult.

Charts comparing the impact of the budget cuts in Missouri to the cuts in the other member states in the Southern Governors' Association are set out in the appendices to this paper.

NORTH CAROLINA

Title I provides financial assistance for supplementary instruction in the basic skills in all 143 school districts in North Carolina. Title I funds are used primarily to pay for additional staff; 96% of whom provide instructional and support services and only 4% perform administrative and clerical functions.

Title I Director, Robert Morley, notes that "almost without exception teachers and administrators report student success stories, parents describe positive changes in children and students report that they are learning in Title I classrooms." Evaluation results provide further convincing evidence that Title I is significantly raising achievement levels in the basic skills. The 1979-80 state evaluation measured achievement gains in terms of NCE scores. A zero NCE score would be expected if the Title I program had no effect; 3 would indicate a good gain; and 7 would mean exemplary results are evident.

In 1980 the range in gains during Fall-to-Spring test cycles in grades 2-12 was 3.7 to 9.1 in reading and 4.8 to more than 10 in math. The 1980-81 gains were higher yet, continuing the steady increase in gains since the NCE data were first collected in 1977.

A major concern in the state is that the current Title I appropriations do not permit school districts to serve all the children eligible for assistance. The state calculates that it is able to serve only half of the elementary school children and at most one-tenth of the secondary students.

Under the Administration's proposal, LEA appropriations for the 1982-83 school year would be reduced by $14.7 million (from $78.7 million in 1981-82 to $64.0 million). This would cut about 34,300 children and 1,491 staff from the program. For the 1983-84 school year, the cuts would be even greater – the appropriation would be reduced by $26.1 million (from $78.7 million in 1981-82 to $52.6 million). This would mean that 54,800 children would be eliminated from the program and 2,371 staff would be laid off. In sum, during this two-year period, $40.8 million fewer Title I funds would be appropriated; 89,100 fewer children would be served; and 3,862 staff would be laid off from the program.

Charts comparing the impact of the budget cuts in North Carolina to the cuts in the other member states in the Southern Governors' Association are set out in the appendices to this paper.

OKLAHOMA

Title I provides financial assistance for supplementary instruction in the basic skills in all school districts in Oklahoma. Title I funds are used primarily to pay for additional staff; 91.5% of whom provide instructional and support services and only 8.5% perform administrative and clerical functions.

Evaluation results now provide "hard data" to show that Title I is significantly raising achievement levels in the basic skills and enabling many children to move back up with their peers. The 1979-80 state evaluation measured achievement gains in terms of NCE scores. A zero NCE score would be expected if the Title I program had no effect; 3 would indicate a good gain; and 7 would mean exemplary results are evident. The twelve-month cycle of testing shows strong gains for students at every grade level in reading and math; the range of low to high gains in reading was 3.23 NCEs (2d grade) to 5.35 NCEs (5th grade); in math the scores ranged from 3.93 NCEs to as high as 12.46 NCEs. Scores were even higher in the nine-month testing cycles.

A major concern in the state is that the current Title I appropriations do not permit school districts to serve all the children eligible for assistance. "Limited resources" have caused them to direct less than 15% of the funds into the secondary programs, despite the need for Title I services among these students. Proposed budget cuts will significantly increase the number of eligible but unserved children at all grade levels.

Under the Administration's proposal, LEA appropriations for the 1982-83 school year would be reduced by $5.8 million (from $33.1 million in 1981-82 to $27.3 million). This would cut about 19,300 children and 689 staff from the program. For the 1983-84 school year, the cuts would be even greater – the appropriation would be reduced by $10.7 million (from $33.1 million in 1981-82 to $22.4 million). This would mean that 30,100 children would be eliminated from the program and 1,078 staff would be laid off. In sum, during this two-year period, $16.5 million fewer Title I funds would be appropriated;

49,400 fewer children would be served; and 1,767 staff would be laid off from the program.

The proposed cuts will also have other adverse effects on the scope and quality of the program. Over the past years, Title I has introduced innovative educational practices such as 5-year-old kindergarten, paraprofessionals in the classrooms, learning centers, and parent involvement, all of which have affected the state educational system. Cutbacks in Title I will signi.icantly damage continued innovation, as well as the tremendous gains in basic skills.

Charts comparing the impact of the budget cuts in Oklahoma to the cuts in the other member states in the Southern Governors' Association are set out in the appendices to this paper.

PUERTO RICO

Title I provides financial assistance for supplementary instruction in the basic skills to over 200,000 children in Puerto Rico. Title I funds are used primarily to pay for additional staff; 90% of whom provide instructional and support services and only 10% perform administrative and clerical functions.

Evaluation results provide strong evidence that Title I is significantly raising achievement levels in the basic skills of the children participating. During the 1979-80 school year, 65% of the children attained or exceeded the expected performance in reading (in Spanish); 63% did so in language composition, 66% in writing and 66% in mathematics.

A major concern in Puerto Rico is that the current Title I appropriation does not permit it to serve all the children eligible for assistance. The Department of Education has said that: "Sixty percent of the Island's three million people have incomes below the U.S. Federal Government's official definition of poverty levels," and the levels of educational deprivation are much higher, and the illiteracy rate is more than 5 times that of the U.S. The vast majority of children in Puerto Rico's schools are educationally deprived."

Under the Administration's proposal, appropriations for the 1982-83 school year would be reduced by $23.1 million (from $103.4 million in 1981-82 to $80.3 million). This would cut about 52,100 children and 1,547 staff from the program. For the 1983-84 school year, the cuts would be even greater – the appropriation would be reduced by $37.3 million (from $103.4 million in 1981-82 to $66.1 million). This would mean that 80,500 children would be eliminated from the program and 2,397 staff would be laid off. In sum, during this two-year period, $60.4 million fewer Title I funds would be appropriated; 132,600 fewer children would be served; and 3,944 staff would be laid off from the program.

Title I funds constitute approximately 17% of total expenditures for public elementary and secondary schools in Puerto Rico. "Given the high poverty level in Puerto Rico, it is unrealistic to expect major increases in local expenditures for eduction," according to the Department of Education.

Charts comparing the impact of the budget cuts in Puerto Rico to the cuts in the other member states in the Southern Governors' Association are set out in the appendices to this paper.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Title I has provided "an invaluable educational resource to all of the 92 school districts" in South Carolina. Title I funds are used primarily to pay for additional staff; 95% of whom provide instructional and support services and only 5% perform administrative and clerical functions.

Evaluation results provide convincing evidence that Title I is significantly raising achievement levels in the basic skills. The 1979-80 state evaluation measured achievement gains in terms of NCE scores. A zero NCE score would be expected if the Title I program had no effect; 3 would indicate a good gain; and 7 would mean exemplary results are evident. The statewide average NCE gains in mathematics have increased from 1.9 NCEs in 1977 to 3.8 NCEs in 1980; reading has grown from 1.3 NCEs to 2.6 NCEs during the same period, with many youngsters gaining at a much higher rate. In a report to the South Carolina State Board of Education, the Title I Director interpreted the steadily increasing gains to be "probably more important than that they simply are positive" and "to indicate that the effectiveness of Title I programs in South Carolina is tending to improve."

A major concern in the state is that the current Title I appropriations permit the school districts to serve less than half of the children eligible for assistance. It is estimated that over 150,000 eligible students, 75,000 of whom are in grades 9-12, remain unserved. Proposed budget cuts will significantly increase the number of eligible but unserved children.

Under the Administration's proposal, LEA appropriations for the 1982-83 school year would be reduced by $10.1 million (from $52.2 million in 1981-82 to $42.1 million). This would cut about 22,200 children and 1,001 staff from the program. For the 1983-84 school year, the cuts would be even greater – the appropriation would be reduced by $17.5 million (from $52.2 million in 1981-82 to $34.7 million). This would mean that 35,500 children would be eliminated from the program and 1,611 staff would be laid off. In sum, during this two-year period, $27.6 million fewer Title I funds would be appropriated; 57,700 fewer children would be served; and 2,612 staff would be laid off from the program.

The proposed cuts will have far reaching effects. Gordon McAndrew, Superintendent of Richland County School District #1, described Title I as "the centerpiece of the district's effort to provide equal educational opportunity for educationally disadvantaged students." "Cripple Title I," he predicts, "as the administration's proposal would do, and you have affected seriously and adversely the education of over 4,000 youngsters in this school system alone. Title I...is a prudent investment to prevent costly human and financial costs in later years."

As Governor Riley stated in a recent speech: "Centuries ago, Edmund Burke wrote: 'Mere parsimony is not economy.... Expense may be an essential part of true economy.' Over and over again, the expense of education has proved Edmund Burke right. For a solid education translates into less crime, less unemployment and better health. And, those are economies that cannot be overlooked as both state and federal governments set priorities and objectives this year or any year."

Charts comparing the impact of the budget cuts in South Carolina to the cuts in the other member states in the Southern Governors' Association are set out in the appendices to this paper.

TENNESSEE

Title I provides financial assistance for supplementary instruction in the basic skills in 146 out of 147 school districts in Tennessee. Title I funds are used primarily to pay for additional staff; 95% of whom provide instructional and support services and only 5% perform administrative and clerical functions.

Evaluation results provide convincing evidence that Title I is significantly raising achievement levels in the basic skills. The 1979-80 state evaluation measured achievement gains in terms of NCE scores. A zero NCE score would be expected if the Title I program had no effect; 3 would indicate a good gain; and 7 would mean exemplary results are evident. Average reading gains at grade levels 2 through 8 ranged from a low of 2.4 NCEs (grade 8) to a high of 8.9 (grade 2) in the nine-month testing cycle. Math gains were significantly higher, ranging from 6.0 to 14.7 NCE gains. Davidson County, which is primarily an urban school district, achieved gains ranging from 5.3 NCEs to 24.4 NCEs. This is the third consecutive year that these students met or surpassed national norms on standardized tests, which is unusual for an urban district. Superintendent Charles O. Frazier says that "these gains indicate that compensatory education pays dividends."

A major concern in the state is that the current Title I appropriations permit the school districts to serve less than 30% of the eligible children in grades 1 through 12. Tens of thousands of eligible students, specially in the secondary grades, remain unserved. Proposed budget cuts will significantly increase the number of eligible but unserved children.

Under the Administration's proposal, LEA appropriations for the 1982-83 school year would be reduced by $12.3 million (from $62.8 million in 1981-82 to $50.5 million). This would cut about 10,000 children and 474 staff from the program. For the 1983-84 school year, the cuts would be even greater – the appropriation would be reduced by $21.2 million (from $62.8 million in 1981-82 to $41.6 million). This would mean that 17,100 children would be eliminated from the program and 741 staff would be laid off. In sum, during this two-year period, $33.5 million fewer Title I funds would be appropriated; 27,100 fewer children would be served; and 1,215 staff would be laid off from the program.

The proposed cuts will also have other adverse effects on the scope and quality of the program. The Title I Director has already noted that "the best qualified staff are leaving the program (Title I program) and going into the regular program." More cuts will increase the loss of teachers, aides and supportive services and will "tear the program to pieces."

Charts comparing the impact of the budget cuts in Tennessee to the cuts in the other member states in the Southern Governors' Association are set out in the appendices to this paper.

TEXAS

Title I provides financial assistance for supplementary instruction in the basic skills in over 90% of the school districts in Texas. Title I funds are used primarily to pay for additional staff; 98% of whom provide instructional and support services and only 2% perform administrative and clerical functions.

Evaluation results provide convincing evidence that Title I is significantly raising achievement levels in the basic skills. William Kirby, of the Texas Department of

Education, believes that "a significant number of Title I children are making up the achievement gap" and cites statistics which show that although Title I children are expected to show 7/10's a year's growth per year in the program, more than 50% of the participants in Texas were achieving 1 1/4, 1 1/2 or 2 years growth. The 1979-80 state evaluation measured achievement gains in terms of NCE scores. A zero NCE score would be expected if the Title I program had no effect; 3 would indicate a good gain; and 7 would mean exemplary results are evident. During that year the average grade level gains in reading on a nine-month testing cycle ranged from a low of 4.1 to a high of 5.5 NCE gains and a range from 3.3 to 6.9 NCE gains in math.

A major concern in the state is that the current Title I appropriations do not permit school districts to serve all the children eligible for assistance. Tens of thousands of eligible students, including "basically the entire group of underachievers at the secondary grades," remain unserved. Proposed budget cuts coupled with inflation will signficantly increase the number of eligible but unserved children.

Under the Administration's proposal, LEA appropriations for the 1982-83 school year would be reduced by $34.3 million (from $168.5 million in 1981-82 to $134.2 million). This would cut about 93,700 children and 3,218 staff from the program. For the 1983-84 school year, the cuts would be even greater – the appropriation would be reduced by $58 million (from $168.5 million in 1981-82 to $110.5 million). This would mean that 150,600 children would be eliminated from the program and 5,113 staff would be laid off. In sum, during this two-year period, $92.3 million fewer Title I funds would be appropriated; 244,300 fewer children would be served; and 8,331 staff would be laid off from the program.

The proposed cuts will also have other adverse effects on the scope and quality of the program. Over the years, Title I has enabled both high-wealth and low-wealth school districts to use innovative and effective instructional tools and methodologies. The value of 5-year-old kindergarten teacher aides, audio-visual equipment, and parent involvement were demonstrated through Title I, causing the state to incorporate these into the regular program. With fewer Title I funds, these and other effective intervention strategies will be decreased, and perhaps eliminated.

Charts comparing the impact of the budget cuts in Texas to the cuts in the other member states in the Southern Governors' Association are set out in the appendices to this paper.

VIRGINIA

Title I provides financial assistance for supplementary instruction in the basic skills in all 137 school districts in Virginia. Title I funds are used primarily to pay for additional staff; 95% of whom provide instructional and support services and only 5% perform administrative and clerical functions.

Evaluation results provide convincing evidence that Title I is significantly raising achievement levels in the basic skills. The 1979-80 state evaluation measured achievement gains in terms of NCE scores. A zero NCE score would be expected if the Title I program had no effect; 3 would indicate a good gain; and 7 would mean exemplary results are evident. During that year the average grade level gains in reading on a nine-month testing cycle ranged from a low of 5.4 NCEs in grade 6 to a high of 9.6 NCEs in grade 2. Math gains were even higher, with the low gain of 7.1 NCEs and a high 9.3 NCEs.

A major concern in the state is that the current Title I appropriations do not permit school districts to serve all the children eligible for assistance. The state Title I Director

estimates that more than 115,000 eligible students, many of which are in the secondary grades, remain unserved. Proposed budget cuts will significantly increase the number of eligible but unserved children.

Under the Administration's proposal, LEA appropriations for the 1982-83 school year would be reduced by $10.3 million (from $56 million in 1981-82 to $45.7 million). This would cut about 25,000 children and 1,239 staff from the program. For the 1983-84 school year, the cuts would be greater – the appropriation would be reduced by $18.4 million (from $56 million in 1981-82 to $37.6 million). This would mean that 40,400 children would be eliminated from the program and 1,908 staff would be laid off. In sum, during this two-year period, $28.7 million fewer Title I funds would be appropriated; 65,400 fewer children would be served; and 3,147 staff would be laid off from the program.

The proposed cuts will also have other adverse effects on the scope and quality of the program. The Title I Director explained that Title I has attracted some of the best personnel in the state. "I can't say enough about our teacher aides, many of whom have been with us a long time and have had excellent training." already, almost 1,000 staff people have been let go because of cuts, causing the system "to operate like bare bones in terms of the ability to be innovative."

Charts comparing the impact of the budget cuts in Virginia to the cuts in the other member states in the southern Governors' Association are set out in the appendices to this paper.

WEST VIRGINIA

Title I provides financial assistance for supplementary instruction in the basic skills in all 52 school districts in West Virginia. Title I funds are used primarily to pay for additional staff; 95% of whom provide instructional and support services and only 5% perform administrative and clerical functions.

Evaluation results provide convincing evidence that Title I is significantly raising achievement levels in the basic skills. The 1979-80 state evaluation measured achievement gains in terms of NCE scores. A zero NCE score would be expected if the Title I program had no effect; 3 would indicate a good gain; and 7 would mean exemplary results are evident. Nine-month achievement test cycles show high gains in participating children in both math and English in grades 2-6; the range of the average grade level NCE gains in reading was 5.0 to 10.4 NCEs and in math 6.2 to 11.4 NCEs.

According to Title I Director David Purdy, less than half the eligible children in West Virginia receive the needed assistance from Title I. "Without full funding, districts had to prioritize and determine to focus funds on preventive intervention in the elementary grades," thereby serving "very few secondary students."

Under the Administration's proposal, appropriations for the 1982-83 school year would be reduced by $5.3 million (from $28.1 million in 1981-82 to $22.8 million). This would cut about 9,600 children and 485 staff from the program. for the 1983-84 school year, the cuts would be even greater – the appropriation would be reduced by $9.3 million (from $28.1 million in 1981-82 to $18.8 million). This would mean that 15,600 children would be eliminated from the program and 836 staff would be laid off. In sum, during this two-year period, $14.6 million fewer Title I funds would be appropriated; 25,200 fewer children would be served; and 1,321 staff would be laid off from the program.

The proposed cuts will also have other adverse effects on the scope and quality of the program. A local administrator in West Virginia reported: "Title I used to be the dumping ground for poor teachers. Today, assignment to a Title I class means prestige, especially for teachers with strong reading backgrounds. The talk about large budget cuts is already resulting in our most capable teachers looking elsewhere for job security. The handwriting is already on the wall that in the future Title I will once again be a dumping ground."

The loss of Title I assistance will also place a tremendous strain on school districts' basic program of instruction since the regular teacher will have to provide greater attention to the under-achievers than in the past, leaving less time for the average and high achievers.

Charts comparing the impact of the budget cuts in West Virginia to the cuts in the other member states in the Southern Governors' Association are set out in the appendices to this paper.

APPENDICES

SOUTHERN GOVERNORS' ASSOCIATION

Resolution Adopted February 23, 1982

TITLE I OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

WHEREAS, Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (in Chapter I of the new Consolidation Act) is a program targeted at those who have severe difficulties in the basic skills of reading and math; and

WHEREAS, many children within the Southern Region have these difficulties; and

WHEREAS, future job opportunities in the South and in the nation will require at least functional literacy and basic mathematic skills because of increasing automation and the influence of high technology; and

WHEREAS, our military needs literate personnel to function efficiently and effectively; and

WHEREAS, Title I repeatedly has been found to have notable positive effects on the basic skills achievement of below-average students, as evidenced by recent studies by the U.S. Department of Education's Budget and Evaluation Annual Report and by findings of the Education Commission of the States' National Assessment of Educational Progress which concluded that the dramatic improvement in reading scores among nine-year-olds in the South between 1970-1980 had been due to assistance provided under Title I; and

WHEREAS, Southern States have a higher proportion of low-income students and disadvantaged students than other regions, and, as a result, receive a greater share of the Title I national appropriation; and

WHEREAS, most Southern States have adopted basic skills and minimum competency programs which depend on Title I funding to provide remedial assistance to students who do not meet state mandated standards; and

WHEREAS, most Southern States' budgets are extremely tight and would not allow the assumption of the Title I program at the state level.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Southern Governors' Association oppose further cuts in the Title I program and urge members of Congress to oppose further cuts in Title I, Chapter I funding for FY 82, for FY 83, and beyond.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Southern Governors' Association publish a document for distribution to the region's political, educational, and economic development leadership, outlining the history and importance of Title I to the South, and the possible consequences of reduced funding levels.

# # #

States Ranked by Relative Incidence of Poverty, 1975-76

1. Mississippi
2. New Mexico
3. Louisiana
4. Arkansas
5. Georgia
6. Kentucky
7. South Carolina
8. Alabama
9. Tennessee
10. Texas

11. West Virginia
12. North Carolina
13. Florida
14. Arizona
15. Oklahoma
16. Vermont
17. South Dakota
18. District of Columbia
19. Missouri
20. Maine

21. Montana
22. North Dakota
23. Illinois
24. Virginia
25. California
26. Idaho
27. Pennsylvania
28. Nebraska
29. Ohio
30. New York

31. Colorado
32. Michigan
33. Oregon
34. Nevada
35. Rhode Island
36. Wyoming
37. Washington
38. Utah
39. Minnesota
40. Delaware

41. New Jersey
42. Indiana
43. Kansas
44. Hawaii
45. Iowa
46. New Hampshire
47. Maryland
48. Wisconsin
49. Massachusetts
50. Connecticut
51. Alaska

Source: NIE, Title I Funds Allocation: The Current Formula at pps. 123-124 (1977) (emphasis added to indicate position of member states).

Percent of Title I Staff Used for Instruction/Support Services and Administration/Clerical in 1979-80

State	% Staff for Instruction/ Support Services	% Staff for Administration/ Clerical
Alabama	97.4	2.6
Arkansas	95.2	4.8
Delaware	94.5	5.5
Florida	95	5
Georgia	95	5
Kentucky	95	5
Louisiana	96	4
Maryland	96.5	3.5
Mississippi	94	6
Missouri	98	2
N. Carolina	96	4
Oklahoma	91.5	8.5
S. Carolina	95	5
Tennessee	95	5
Texas	98	2
Virginia	95	5
W. Virginia	95	5
Puerto Rico	90	10
Virgin Islands	--	--
Total	95%	5%

Source: USDE 1979-80 ESEA Title I Reports Submitted Annually by States (Form OE 686-2) (unpublished).

Comparison of Title I Appropriations* for 1981-82
with Recommended Cutbacks in
1982-83 and 1983-84
(Figures Expressed in Millions of Dollars)

State	Base Year 1981-82	Proposed Approp. for 1982-83 School Year	Amount of Reductions	Proposed Approp. for 1983-84 School Year	Amount of Reductions	Cumulative Reductions 1982-1984 School Years
Alabama	$68.8	$55.3	$13.5	$45.6	$23.2	$36.7
Arkansas	39.2	31.6	7.6	26.0	13.2	20.8
Delaware	6.7	5.5	1.2	4.5	2.2	3.4
Florida	81.3	65.2	16.1	53.7	27.6	43.7
Georgia	74.5	60.2	14.3	49.5	25.0	39.3
Kentucky	53.0	43.0	10.0	35.4	17.6	27.6
Louisiana	78.4	62.9	15.5	51.8	26.6	42.1
Maryland	45.4	36.5	8.9	30.0	15.4	24.3
Mississippi	66.2	53.0	13.2	43.7	22.5	35.7
Missouri	48.6	39.2	9.4	32.3	16.3	25.7
N. Carolina	78.7	64.0	14.7	52.6	26.1	40.8
Oklahoma	33.1	27.3	5.8	22.4	10.7	16.5
S. Carolina	52.2	42.1	10.1	34.7	17.5	27.6
Tennessee	62.8	50.5	12.3	41.6	21.2	33.5
Texas	168.5	134.2	34.3	110.5	58.0	92.3
Virginia	56.0	45.7	10.3	37.6	18.4	28.7
W. Virginia	28.1	22.8	5.3	18.8	9.3	14.6
Puerto Rico	103.4	80.3	23.1	66.1	37.3	60.4
Virgin Islands	3.0	2.5	.5	2.0	1.0	1.5
TOTALS	$1,148	$921.8	$226.1	$758.8	$389.1	$615.2

*This figure includes funds provided under the LEA Basic and Concentration grants; it does not include Title I funds appropriated for state-operated programs.

Source: Department of Education, Title I Appropriations (unpublished).

APPENDIX E

Estimated Number of Children
(In Thousands) Eliminated
From Title I Because of
Proposed Budget Cuts

	No. of Program Participants 1979-80 School Yr[1]	Estimated No. of Program Participants 1982-83 Sch Yr[2]	Estimate of Children Eliminated from Title I Program in 1982-83[3]	Estimated No. of Program Participants 1983-84 Sch Yr[4]	Estimate of Children Eliminated from Title I Program in 1983-84[5]	Total No. of Children Eliminated for 1982-83 and 1983-84 Sch Yr[6]
Alabama	130.8	99.5	31.3	82.1	48.7	80.0
Arkansas	84.0	66.4	18.2	54.6	30.0	48.2
Delaware	12.2	9.4	2.8	7.7	4.5	7.3
Florida	157.9	117.4	40.5	96.7	61.2	101.7
Georgia	159.6	120.4	39.2	99.0	60.6	99.8
Kentucky	114.2	86.0	28.2	70.8	43.4	71.6
Louisiana	163.1	125.8	37.3	103.6	59.5	96.8
Maryland	63.3	47.5	15.8	39.0	24.3	40.1
Mississippi	131.8	106.0	25.8	78.7	53.1	78.9
Missouri	87.4	70.6	16.8	58.1	29.3	46.1
North Carolina	149.5	115.2	34.3	94.7	54.8	89.1
Oklahoma	79.4	60.1	19.3	49.3	30.1	49.4
South Carolina	98.0	75.8	22.2	62.5	35.5	57.7
Tennessee	50.4	40.4	10.0	33.3	17.1	27.1
Texas	415.8	322.1	93.7	265.2	150.6	244.3
Virginia	111.8	86.8	25.0	71.4	40.4	65.4
West Virginia	43.8	34.2	9.6	28.2	15.6	25.2
Puerto Rico	2[illegible].7	160.6	52.1	132.2	80.5	132.6
Virgin Islands	—	—	—	—	—	—
TOTALS	2,266.3	1,744.2	522.1	1,427.1	839.2	1,361.3

1. The 1979-80 School Year was selected as the base year for purposes of comparison because it is the most recent year for which nation-wide data are available.

2. This figure is derived by determining the number of children participating in Title I programs in 1979-80 School Year divided by the LEA appropriation for that year and then multiplying that figure by the proposed appropriation for the 1982-83 School Year.

3. This figure is derived by subtracting the estimated number of Title I program participants in 1982-83 from the number of program participants in 1979-80.

4. See point 2 above, substituting the 1983-84 figure for the 1982-83 figure.

5. See point 3 above, substituting the 1983-84 figure for the 1982-83 figure.

6. This figure is derived by adding the estimated number of children eliminated in 1982-83 and 1983-84.

Source: USDE unpublished data submitted on Form OE 686-2 by each state for 1979-80 school year. Calculations made for purposes of this report.

Estimated Staff Laid Off By
Title I Program Because
of Proposed Budget Cuts

	Staff Employed 1979-80 School Year[1] (Base Yr.)	Estimated Staff Employed 1982-83 School Yr.[2]	Estimated Staff Laid Off by Title I in 1982-83 School Year[3]	Estimated Staff Employed 1983-84 School Year[4]	Estimated Staff Laid Off by Title I in 1983-84 School Yr.[5]	Total Estimated Staff Laid Off in 1982-83 and 1983-84 School Year[6]
Alabama	4458	3431	1027	2826	1633	2660
Arkansas	3941	3039	902	2502	1438	2340
Delaware	494	376	118	310	185	303
Florida	6803	5020	1783	4134	2669	4452
Georgia	3559	2768	792	2279	1280	2072
Kentucky	3945	3051	893	2513	1432	2325
Louisiana	6033	4591	1442	3781	2253	3695
Maryland	4230	3738	492	2643	1586	2078
Mississippi	6004	4614	1390	3800	2204	3594
Missouri	3317	2626	691	2163	1154	1845
North Carolina	6477	4986	1491	4107	2371	3862
Oklahoma	2896	2207	689	1818	1078	1767
South Carolina	4456	3455	1001	2845	1611	2612
Tennessee	1990	1516	474	1248	741	1215
Texas	13,951	10,733	3218	8838	5113	8331
Virginia	5032	3793	1239	3123	1908	3147
West Virginia	2473	1988	485	1637	836	1321
Puerto Rico	6364	4817	1547	3967	2397	3944
Virgin Islands	—	--	--	--	--	--
TOTALS	86,423	66,749	19,674	54,534	31,889	51,563

1. The 1979-80 School Year was selected as the base year for purposes of comparison because it is the most recent year for which nation-wide data are available.

2. This figure is derived by determining the number of staff employed in 1979 divided by the LEA appropriation for 1979-80 and then multiplying that figure by the proposed appropriation for 1982-83 school year. This figure consists of professional and paraprofessionals. The estimate for 1982-83 assumes a proportionate reduction of professionals and paraprofessionals. Based on state interviews, many school districts will be laying off paraprofessionals in greater proportion to professionals. If this is the case, the figure underestimates the number of staff who will be laid-off by the Title I program.

3. This figure is deived by subtracting the estimated number of staff employed in 1982-83 from the number of staff employed in 1979-80 School Year.

4. See point 2 above, substituting the 1983-84 proposed appropriation for the 1982-83 figure.

5. See point 3 above, substituting the 1983-84 figure for the 1982-83 figure.

6. This figure is derived by adding the estimated number of persons laid off in 1982-83 to the estimated staff laid off in 1983-84.

Source: USDE unpublished data submitted on Form OE 686-2 by each state for 1979-80 school year. Calculations made for purposes of this report.

Comparison of Title I Expenditures in the 17 States in the Southern Governors' Association With The Rest of the Nation

State	Total 1977 Expenditures	1977 Title I Allotment	Title I as Percent of Total
Alabama	$ 869,748,000	$ 46,856,194	5.4
Arkansas	466,185,000	29,388,487	6.3
Delaware	213,513,000	5,989.339	2.8
Florida	2,011,723,000	81,023,365	6.0
Georgia	1,300,517,000	51,701,581	3.9
Kentucky	719,821,000	38,187,889	5.3
Louisiana	1,006,845,000	56,061,676	5.7
Maryland	1,436,175,000	34,183,719	2.4
Mississippi	536,849,000	46,115,961	8.9
Missouri	1,167,463,000	34,678,447	3.0
N. Carolina	1,373,365,000	59,582,110	4.3
Oklahoma	737,118,000	22,643,692	3.1
S. Carolina	682,387,000	36,992,607	5.4
Tennessee	986,698,000	43,132,809	4.4
Texas	3,512,137,000	147,992,810	4.2
Virginia	1,467,142,000	44,464,610	3.0
W. Virginia	501,084,000	18,946,931	3.8
TOTAL FOR REGION*			4.6
TOTAL FOR REMAINING STATES			2.6

*Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands not included

Source: National Advisory Council of the Education of Disadvantaged Children, Title I, Today: A Factbook (Spring 1981).